

BREXIT HASN'T HAPPENED - LIB DEMS & SCOTS MAKE SURE IT CAN'T - FOLLOW THE LOGIC IN THIS UPDATE



This UK government [e-petition website](#) is attracting historical support. Every hour since it opened many thousands have backed it and signed up. Its intent is to reverse the marginal outcome of the referendum on 23 June. However, there is a secondary motive behind it and that is to have some sensible laws in place so that fundamental changes to the UK's "constitution" for want of a better description can't be made on the back of a flimsy minority.

The petition calls upon HM Government to implement a rule that if the remain or leave vote is less than 60% based on a turnout of less than 75% there should be another referendum. Paradoxically it was lodged before the referendum by those supporting Brexit because they thought they were going to lose! Most countries (eg the USA) can't just change their constitutions or fundamental laws on a simple majority vote and the UK shouldn't be able to either.

Be a part of history. Vote for a [proper referendum](#) and share this with all your friends and colleagues. Over two million signatures have been obtained in about 48 hours even though the website crashed but many more signatures are expected, and the website is now open again. The government has to listen and has to hold a debate about it because more than 100,000 signatures have been obtained but the more signatures the more weight this carries among the two thirds or more of Members of Parliament who want to remain in the EU and

who are not bound by law to implement the referendum. The UK has not left the EU and cannot do so until "Article 50" of the Lisbon Treaty is ratified by the UK Parliament.

It doesn't matter if you voted in the referendum – you can vote on this petition as long as you were entitled to vote on the referendum. As one would expect, some idiots are voting under false pretences but the vast majority of the votes to date appear genuine and sensible.

Finally, if there are any lawyers out there who are interested could they please contact me at [Faire Sans Dire](#) if they know of any ways in which those leading politicians involved in this referendum (no matter what side they were on) can be brought to task for misrepresentation (or the like) either in a civil court or a criminal court assuming such can be proven? Many want to see justice done.

Postscript/Update - 20.15 London Time Sunday 26 June 2016

The Liberal Democrats have pledged to [re-join the EU](#) effectively as soon as possible assuming the UK exits. The Scottish National Party has indicated it will (possibly along with Northern Irish MPs) block the referendum from becoming law. Given all this turmoil and uncertainty it is almost certain that there will be a general election before the UK formally and legally ceases to be an EU member. As over two thirds of Parliament are against leaving the EU many MPs may join the Lib Dems which means they will hold the balance of power maybe by next month.

So, if the current government is defeated should it try to implement Article 50 there will be no exit based on this referendum anyway. What is more a new government would not be morally beholden to the outcome of a referendum not implemented by the preceding government as it would have a new mandate.

So, in all probability there will be no exit based on this referendum anyway. Why? Is it fair? Is it democratic? Arguably yes - it is fair and democratic with a shade of no! The Lib Dems are stating unequivocally that the referendum result was secured on a campaign of [lies](#). So are many who now realise they were completely conned by those campaigning for Brexit.

Indeed, Farage has even admitted the main Brexit campaign slogan about saving £360m a month and reinvesting it in the NHS or whatever was wrong, untrue and misleading: it was a pack of lies. It is interesting that the [New Statesman](#) was one of the first to break that news even though it was one of the first to support Farage who for our US readers is seen by some as the UK's equivalent to Trump.

Meanwhile more than three million people have signed [the petition](#) to hold a second **proper referendum** after new laws are put in place to prevent major "constitutional" changes on flimsy majorities etc. Major "constitutional" changes should only be permitted if thresholds are met such that the outcome of the referendums if implemented do not divide the country. There should also be clearer laws about making misrepresentations when campaigning with serious penalties if those laws are broken.

No doubt there will be many more who sign the petition indirectly supporting changes in the laws applicable to referendums so spread the word and draw attention to the truth about the [Brexiters' lies](#) which some of their main campaigners have confessed were made to influence the vote. The outcome of any narrowly won referendum where voters based their

decisions on lies made by campaigners is not a democratic basis for changes with such fundamental consequences. Indeed, it is not a proper basis for deciding anything let alone something that resulted in the break-up of the United Kingdom.

Put another way, if you'd gone and bought "sovereignty" at Amazon and discovered within 24 hours that you had been conned then like most normal people you would no doubt want to revoke the transaction.

Bill Fairclough, Faire Sans Dire

This article was first published on 25 June 2016.